

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-10 are now in the application. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 9 have been amended. Claims 2 and 8 have been cancelled.

In item 2 on page 2 of the Office action, claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, and 10 have been rejected as being anticipated by Papadakis et al. (5,461,921) under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant respectfully traverses with regard to claims 2 and 8.

The limitations defined by claims 2 and 8 have been placed into claims 1 and 7, respectively.

Papadakis et al. do not teach using a compression coder for compressing the information to be transmitted. Column 9, lines 25-35, which has been cited by the Examiner merely describes generating a spread spectrum signal. Papadakis et al. merely teach a method for testing materials by sending ultrasonic signals through the materials and by using the distorted test signal that has reflected through the material. There is no teaching or motivation to compress the test signal.

Claims 1 and 7 are patentable.

In item 4 on page 4 of the Office action, claims 3 and 9 have been rejected as being obvious over Papadakis et al.

(5,461,921) in view of Waters et al. (5,155,741) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

These claims are patentable for the reasons specified above with regard to Papadakis et al. and claims 1 and 7. Even if there were a suggestion to combine the references, the claimed invention could not have been obtained.

In paragraph 5 on page 4 of the Office action, claim 6 has been rejected as being obvious over Papadakis et al.

(5,461,921) in view of Scott (6,522,642) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 6 is patentable for the reasons specified above with regard to Papadakis et al. and claim 1. Even if there were a suggestion to combine the references, the claimed invention could not have been obtained.

In item 5 on page 5 of the Office action, claim 5 has been rejected as being obvious over Papadakis et al. (5,461,921) in view of Nakamura (4,591,811) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 5 is patentable for the reasons specified above with regard to Papadakis et al. and claim 1. Even if there were a suggestion to combine the references, the claimed invention could not have been obtained.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 7. Claims 1 and 7 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1 or 7, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3-7, and 9-10 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, he is respectfully requested to telephone counsel so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Appl. No. 09/751,959
Amdt. dated October 17, 2003
Reply to Office action of 7/18/2003

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and
Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark P. Weichselbaum
Reg. No. 43,248

For Applicant

MPW:cgm

October 17, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101